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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF NTT TASK FORCE FINAL REPORT

Jointly constituted by the Provost and the Faculty Senate in February 2010, the UNCG Task Force on Non-Tenure Track Faculty was given two central charges: to review existing UNCG policies and practices governing non-tenure track (NTT) faculty; and to recommend changes to improve NTT faculty working conditions at UNCG. Over the next two years, the Task Force created an inventory of policies and practices regarding NTT faculty (Phase I Report), and surveyed NTT faculty views and preferences about their working conditions (Phase II Survey). The Task Force's Final Report, delivered to the Provost and Faculty Senate on March 26, 2012, summarizes the Phase I Report and the Phase II Survey results, and articulates recommendations for the improvement of NTT faculty working conditions at UNCG.

The Phase I Report provides a "snap-shot" of policies and practices as these stood during the 2009-2010 academic year, formed by information gathered by Task Force members from the academic units. This information confirms that tenure-track (TT) faculty enjoy a much wider array of rights and responsibilities than NTT faculty do, even when NTT faculty members may have equivalent credentials and/or comparable years of experience and service at UNCG. Perhaps more surprisingly, the Report shows that NTT faculty employment policies and practices vary so widely among, and within, academic units that there is considerable inequity of rights and responsibilities even within the NTT faculty ranks.

The Phase II Survey, which was made available to 433 NTT faculty through Qualtrics, gathered 185 responses (a response rate of 42.7%) to 59 items in these categories: Demographic Background, Teaching, Promotion and Salary, Job Security, Governance, Grants and Awards, Retirement, and The Nature of Your Work. The responses produced a considerable body of detailed information, both quantitative and qualitative, about the specific situations and perceived conditions of the respondents' work at UNCG. The respondents prioritized their top six important issues as follows, beginning with the most important: job security; salary disparity; opportunities for promotion; teaching load; eligibility for awards; and departmental participation and voting rights.

The Task Force's recommendations to the Provost and Senate for the improvement of NTT working conditions at UNCG in three categories (Professional Conditions and Voice, Compensation, and Professional Responsibility, Support and Recognition) reflect the conditions and concerns detailed in the Phase I Report and the Phase II Survey results. NTT faculty participation in governance at all levels of the University should be given top priority followed by broad, University-wide standards for NTT employment.
INTRODUCTION

In 2002, the University of North Carolina General Administration (GA) submitted a report and recommendations to the Board of Governors addressing issues raised by the increasing number of Non-Tenure Track (NTT) faculty working in the UNC system. In 2008, the UNC campuses reported to GA on progress toward the 2002 recommendations, and GA re-instituted a UNC system Committee to Review Policies Related to Non-Tenure Track Faculty, charging the Committee to review existing UNC policies and national “best practices” related to NTT faculty and make recommendations for improving their working conditions. Recognizing the need for a new review of practices at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro (UNCG), Provost David Perrin and the Faculty Senate jointly appointed a UNCG Task Force on Non-Tenure Track Faculty in February, 2010. This Task Force was given several charges: to review existing UNCG policies and practices governing NTT faculty; to recommend changes to improve NTT faculty working conditions at UNCG; and to support future UNCG responses to the UNC system NTT Faculty Committee (currently inactive).

The proportion of NTT members of the UNCG faculty grew steadily over the ten years between 1997 and 2007, rising from 43% to 53% of combined full and part-time faculty (UNCG Fact Book 2009-2010). This increasing proportion of NTT faculty at UNCG over this period paralleled increases among university faculty nationally and at the 15 UNC universities that had tenure systems (see Phase I Report, p.2). At UNCG, as at other universities system and nation-wide, NTT faculty have for some years supported the University’s success in achieving its educational mission with their increasingly essential contributions to teaching and research.

The Task Force’s Phase I Report, summarized in this Final Report and appended in full, gathered information about the rights and benefits of NTT faculty at UNCG. This Final Report also presents summary results of the Phase II Survey, an online survey which gathered the views and preferences of NTT faculty about how their working conditions might be improved. What are the greatest concerns and most strongly felt needs of UNCG’s non-tenure track faculty? Job security? Equal pay? Reasonable teaching loads? Fuller participation in shared governance? Eligibility for mentoring, promotion, research, or phased retirement? Knowledge of these priorities can help guide UNCG as it endeavors to achieve equitable working conditions for UNCG’s large NTT faculty contingent.

To provide adequate context for the recommendations that the Task Force developed from its work, this Final Report includes: a timeline of the Task Force’s work; summary results of the Phase I Report; a description and summary results of the Phase II Survey; review of the 2008 UNCG response to UNC recommendations regarding NTT faculty; and the Task Force recommendations themselves. The complete Phase I Report is available in a separate document.
posted with this Final Report. Available upon request are the Phase II Qualtrics Survey and full results.

**TIMELINE OF THE TASK FORCE’S WORK**

**February 2010:** Task Force jointly appointed by Provost and Faculty Senate

**March 2010 – December 2010:** Task Force members gather information about university and unit/department policies and practices regarding rights, benefits, appointment, promotion, etc. of NTT faculty. Phase II survey drafting begins.

**November 3, 2010:** Task Force Co-Chairs present brief account of planned work to the Faculty Senate

**January-February 2011:** Phase II Survey completed, submitted for approval to IRB

**February 25, 2011:** Completed Phase I Interim Report previewed to Provost Perrin and Faculty Senate leadership

**March 4, 2011:** Phase I Report distributed to all NTT faculty

**March 21, 2011:** Phase II Survey distributed to all NTT faculty

**April 6, 2011:** Phase II Survey closes

**April – September 2011:** Analysis of Phase II survey results

**October 2011 – March 2012:** Drafting of the Final Report

**March 26, 2012:** Final Report distributed to all faculty, Provost Perrin, and Faculty Senate

**April 4, 2012:** Co-Chairs present Task Force findings to Faculty Senate

**April 25, 2012:** Co-Chairs present Task Force findings to Deans Council

**SUMMARY OF THE PHASE I REPORT**

The Phase I Report, issued in March 2011 to all NTT faculty, the Provost and the Chair of the Faculty Senate, included information gathered by committee members concerning rights and benefits of NTT faculty compared to those of their tenure track colleagues as well as an inventory of the practices and policies of each academic unit on campus. The inventory
information compiled from the schools, College, departments and programs was intended as a large-scale “snapshot” of the state of affairs in the 2009-2010 academic year. For instance, the reorganizations that resulted in the present School of Music, Theater and Dance, and the School of Health and Human Sciences, have altered some of the configurations described in the Report. The findings in the summary below, however, are not significantly affected by such changes.

The most striking findings that are included at the end of the Phase I Report are repeated here along with a summary:

• Without a presence in any university-wide governing body, NTT faculty members do not participate directly in the determination of university policies and procedures.
• There is great variability in terms of departmental participation of NTT faculty across the campus.
• NTT faculty are not eligible for a program that would assist them in improving their teaching abilities through mentoring by experienced faculty members.
• NTT faculty with a terminal degree are eligible for appointment to the Graduate Faculty.
• NTT faculty teach an average of 45% more students per course than TT faculty and an average of more than 25% more students per course than Graduate Teaching Assistants.
• NTT faculty receive $3,000 less for teaching excellence awards and are not rewarded by the Board of Governors at all.
• NTT Faculty are eligible for 57% of the university professional development and research grants and are not eligible for most intramural funding.
• Approximately 57% (4/7) of units on campus have promotion policies for non-tenure track faculty.
• The average salary difference between TT and NTT in the university as a whole is almost $39,000. The difference decreases to $28,000 when a promotion policy is present.
• Non-Tenure Track faculty employment contracts provide flexibility to the university at the cost of job security for those filling the NTT positions.
• NTT faculty who are not granted the exceptional Emeritus status cannot continue to use the library, recreation center, etc., even if they are employees of long-standing.
• Because all NTT faculty are ineligible for phased retirement, they cannot maintain reduced professional connections to the university for a short time as they transit into retirement, even if they have been at UNCG for many years.
• NTT faculty as a percentage of total faculty at UNCG has decreased by 7% from 2007 to 2009. The percentage of NTT who are part time has increased from 25% to 29% in academic year 2009-2010.
• These trends most likely reflect the influence of the budget crisis over the past two years. Untenured full time positions are at greatest risk during periods of budget cuts.

Broadly speaking, this collected information and the initial factual conclusions of the report may be summarized in two ways. First, and not surprisingly, this information confirms that TT
faculty enjoy a much wider array of rights and responsibilities than NTT faculty do, even when NTT faculty members may have equivalent credentials and/or comparable years of experience and service at UNCG. Second, perhaps more surprisingly, the inventory in particular shows that NTT faculty employment policies and practices vary so widely among, and within, academic units that there is considerable inequity of rights and responsibilities even within the NTT faculty ranks.

THE PHASE II SURVEY

Description. In the Spring Semester of 2011, 433 NTT faculty, both full-time and part-time, were asked to complete a Qualtrics survey compiled by the Task Force with IRB approval in order to evaluate the various elements differentiating NTT faculty from their tenure track co-workers, collect input regarding the working conditions of NTT faculty at UNCG, and gather responses from NTT faculty regarding future recommendations. All respondents were asked to read the Phase I Report before completing the survey. The 59 items were categorized into the following eight sections: Demographic Background, Teaching, Promotion and Salary, Job Security, Governance, Grants and Awards, Retirement, and The Nature of Your Work. Most sections contained both quantitative and qualitative questions; for example, in the Promotion and Salary section participants were asked to indicate their approximate income in 2010-2011 from a choice of 12 ranges and if they were eligible for promotion within their unit. At the end of this section they were given the opportunity to express their perceptions about promotion opportunities within their unit.

Results. One hundred eighty five (185) NTT faculty out of 433 responded to the survey for an overall response rate of 42.7%. In the summary of the Phase II Survey results below, we present and interpret the quantitative and qualitative results which had the greatest impact on our recommendations. The full results of the Survey are available upon request.

Please note that the raw numbers and percentages in the items below do not match the total of 185 responses logged by the Qualtrics survey instrument and frequently vary between items. These discrepancies occur because most respondents chose not to answer all questions, and some answered very selectively.

1. Demographic Background (PT and FT)
   • 72% (99) were full-time and 28% (38) were part-time faculty.
   • 33% (37) had a doctorate, 11% (12) an MFA and 53% (73) a Masters.
   • 55% (75) were Lecturers, 10.22% (14) Instructors, and 20% (28) held ranks on the APT.
   • 53% (73) were from Arts and Sciences, 9% (12) from Health and Human Performance, 9% (12) from Nursing, 8% (11) from Education, 6% (8) from Human and Environmental
Sciences, 5% (7) from The Bryan School of Business, 5% (7) from The Graduate School and 4% (5) from The School of Music, Theatre and Dance.

- 48% (68) had been employed for three to nine years while 26% (36) had been at UNCG for 10 or more years.
- 61% (84) were female and 37% (51) male.
- 73% of their responsibilities were teaching, followed by 6.7% administration, 6.3% advising, 6% service, and 5% supervision.

2. Teaching (PT and FT)

- In the Spring Semester of 2011, 31% (43) were teaching four classes/sections while 56% (76) were teaching one to three and 8% (11) five or more.
- In the Spring Semester of 2011, NTT faculty taught an average of 54 lower division undergraduates, 20 upper division undergraduates, and five graduate students.
- 78% (107) reported that they had never received any mentoring for their teaching responsibilities while 22% (30) said that they had.

Summary/interpretation of qualitative responses: There was a wide range of opinions about teaching loads. Many thought that they should teach fewer courses, but many were content with the typical 4/4 full-time load (they are paid by the section).

There was a widespread desire to receive mentoring and other resources commensurate with their superior student-face-time and contribution to the educational mission of the university. Some respondents thought that NTTs should be credited for engagement in research in order to continue to advance in knowledge of their fields, thus enhancing quality of instruction.

Some respondents wanted to expand opportunities to teach upperclass undergraduates. Most of those who commented believed that NTT faculty teaching award winners should be financially compensated at the same rates as TT faculty.

Examples of faculty comments: “It is not surprising, yet disturbing, that NTT faculty teach more. NTT faculty need to do research in order to grow in their field but with so many hours devoted to teaching/preparation (as many NTT faculty teach up to 5 sections among more than one campus a semester), there is little time for research.”

“But the problem remains that while we’re told we’re the ‘backbone of the institution’ for teaching courses tenured or tenure-track professors cringe at, we have very little say—as the Phase I Report suggests—on how to improve our lot or our reputation (a reputation that often pegs us as second-rate teachers, though without training, that seems an unfair conclusion.”
3. **Promotion and Salary (FT)**
   - In 2010-2011, 22% (28) of the FT NTT faculty respondents made salaries in the range of $35,000-$44,999 followed by 17% (21) in the range of $55,000-$64,999.
   - 20% (26) made below $35,000.
   - 15% (19) made $65,000 or above.
   - 71% (63) of the FT NTT were not eligible for promotion while 29% (26) were.

**Summary/interpretation of qualitative responses:**

**Eligibility for Promotion**

When asked to identify the biggest challenges connected with their NTT status at UNCG, respondents cited the lack of promotion opportunities as a major concern. They also noted low salary, poor job security, and a general lack of respect as contributing factors to their reported low morale.

Where promotion opportunities for NTT faculty do exist, the criteria were not always clear to them. Several respondents pointed to a troubling disparity between NTT and TT faculty even where promotion is available to NTTs, a disparity linked, in part, to this perceived lack of clarity. The lack of opportunity for professional advancement was connected by some respondents to a perceived lack of respect and recognition for the contributions of NTT faculty.

Some units (e.g., the School of Nursing) appear to have well defined promotion criteria in place for NTT faculty, but the lack of such criteria and of promotion opportunities in other units (e.g., the College of Arts & Sciences) creates a perception of inequality among NTT faculty in different units that some respondents find highly demoralizing.

**Salary**

Close to half the respondents (42%) indicated that their current salary is below $44,999. A significant percentage of respondents (17%) indicated that they are not eligible for salary increments, and an even higher percentage (26%) did not even know whether or not they are eligible.

Concern over low salaries was cited frequently by respondents as one of the major challenges of their NTT status at UNCG, exceeded only by concern over job security. Salary was often linked to a general perception of unfair treatment.

Despite their substantial credentials of training and experience, a significant number of NTT faculty reported that that their salary is inadequate to meet their most basic financial
needs, and they are sometimes forced to supplement their income from other sources, further adding to an already heavy workload and high level of stress.

Examples of faculty comments: “Promotion would imply that the department deems the work I do as valuable—my perception is that the department does not value the work that I do; thereby, promotion isn’t a reality.”

“As far as I understand it, most lecturers are like baseball pitchers from the ‘20s—you throw hard for a couple years and then the owners send you on your way.”

“All faculty on clinical track are eligible to apply for promotion. I am actually at highest level of clinical professor.”

4. **Job Security (FT)**
   - 58% (59) indicated they were on a one year contract.

Summary/interpretation of qualitative responses: The overwhelming majority of respondents did not feel secure in their jobs due to reduction in contract duration, budgetary cutbacks or the ongoing uncertainty about contract renewals. The following responses reflect this predominant feeling among NTT faculty:

Examples of faculty comments: “If the university continues to rely heavily on lower paid faculty to shoulder the brunt of the teaching load, there should be more job security available for full-time employees.”

“I have absolutely no job security. As the contract is written, it can be terminated if there is no longer funding for my position. Again, my contract was initially for 12 months and has now been reduced to 6 months. I would not have taken this job if I had understood how insecure the position is.”

“I have a PhD in my content area and yet have not been offered more than a year to year contract. I have worked at UNCG for 3 years and worry every year about budget cuts and losing my job.”

“After 24 years at UNCG, I still have only a 12-month contract.”

5. **Governance (FT)**
   - 90% (86) were eligible to attend and participate in departmental faculty meetings while 10% (10) were not.
   - 40% (36) were not eligible to vote on departmental policy decisions and 60% (54) were eligible (excluding tenure and promotion decisions for TT faculty).
   - 57% (50) were not eligible to serve on departmental search committees and 43% (38) were.
• 83% (69) were eligible to serve on other departmental committees while 17% (14) were not.

Summary/interpretation of qualitative responses: UNCG has two existing Senates (one for faculty and one for staff) to participate in university governance. While Staff Senate is open to all staff, Faculty Senate is only open to tenure track faculty and professional librarians, thus excluding roughly half of UNCG faculty at the present time.

The majority of respondents believe that they should be better represented in departmental governance, noting in particular their important instructional contributions. Their responses highlight the discrepancy between the heavy teaching loads of NTT faculty and their low representation in deciding curricular policy.

Several faculty indicated that NTT participation in departmental governance is subject to the whim of the current chair/head. Some responses pointed to a potential link between lack of representation and inappropriate or heavy work assignments. Even among those NTT faculty who do have a vote in their departments, many find that their vote is not always counted.

Examples of faculty comments: “I find it frustrating that I am not represented by either staff or faculty senate and that I cannot participate more fully in the governance of the university.”

“I was elected to the senate a few years ago and then they said, ‘Oops, you can’t do that.’ I was surprised to learn that there is no one to speak for me.”

“I find it very demotivating and contradictory that I can be asked to serve on various committees but not be allowed to vote on certain decisions (like recruiting decisions at the departmental level) because of my NTT status. There seems to be a fair amount of responsibility without authority in the leadership and management style of this School.”

“Despite the fact that NTT faculty do the vast bulk of teaching in the department, NTT faculty has almost no say in the decisions that affect teaching within the department.”

“What is it about being NTT makes me unable to provide quality input or service in governance? Why not let anyone with sufficient support and experience serve in the faculty senate?”

6. Grants and Awards (FT)
• Only 14 of 101 (14%) respondents had ever been nominated or applied for The Alumni Teaching Excellence Award; 85 marked “not applicable.”
• 12 out of 101 (12%) received an Advancement of Teaching and Learning Grant and 88 (87%) marked “not applicable.”
• 24 of 101 (24%) received a Mini-Grant while 74 (76%) marked “not applicable.”
• 4 out of 101 (4%) received a Regular Faculty Research Grant and 97 (96%) marked “not applicable.”
• 5 out of 101 (5%) received a grant from the Kohler Fund and 95 (95%) marked “not applicable.”
• 6 out of the 37 (16%) people who commented had no knowledge that they were even eligible for some awards and grants.

Summary/interpretation of qualitative responses: More than half of the respondents in the survey noted inequity in availability, access, and compensation for grants and awards. These respondents clearly thought that more “...support for grant development opportunities...and greater inclusion with tenure track and tenured faculty” are necessary. Such comments speak to the varying support services already in existence for tenured and tenure-track faculty, services designed to support TT development toward promotion but generally excluding NTT faculty whether those NTT faculty are eligible for promotion or not.

There is also a significant disparity in awards funding for TT and NTT faculty. The inequity damages morale and also reduces compensatory support for inadequately paid faculty who provide both current professional expertise and valuable teaching across the university.

The second largest group of survey responses emphasized the lack of awareness of even the availability of grants and awards for NTT faculty. A third group did not comment at all, perhaps reflecting the disenfranchisement felt among NTT faculty.

Examples of Faculty Comments: “It is disturbing that NTT faculty are ineligible for some of these awards and/or receive a smaller award.”

“Did not realize there were as many awards or grants that clinical faculty could utilize.”

“Information about such grants and awards should be easier to gain.”

“To deny this opportunity for equity in awards to NTT faculty creates an inappropriate class system between NTT and TT faculty positions and sends the wrong message to NTT faculty about their value and contributions to the University and the University system.”

“I’m unclear why NTT faculty receive $3000 less for teaching excellence awards. Good teaching is good teaching!!!”
“The difference in the dollar amounts for the Teaching Excellence Awards between grad. Fac. And NTT is like a slap in the face to all NTT faculty, and shows exactly how little we’re valued by the University.”

7. **Retirement (only qualitative responses in this category) (FT)**

Summary/interpretation of qualitative responses: The survey did not ask specific questions in this area, because full-time NTT faculty are eligible for state or ORP benefits on the same basis as any other full-time University employee. However, as the Phase I Report explains, Emeritus status is available for retiring NTT faculty only by exception, and phased retirement is not an option for any NTT faculty member, regardless of years of full-time service. (This is an interesting rule since TT faculty entering phased retirement are required to give up their tenure when they do so.) So the survey provided an open-ended prompt to allow NTT faculty to express any thoughts about retirement rights and benefits.

Examples of Faculty Comments: “I did not realize I am ineligible for phased retirement and I think that it is unfair since I have been here over 30 years. I am glad that the University still supports health insurance for its retired employees.”

“I am surprised that NTT faculty cannot enjoy the same post-retirement benefits (use of library, etc.), regardless of their rank or longevity of service to the University, that can be enjoyed by TT faculty. I think this sends a message that NTT faculty are not as valued and that teaching/education in the University is not truly as valued as one would be led to believe. This inequity in post-retirement opportunities serves to create a class system between NTT and TT faculty positions in the University system and in UNCG.”

“Not fair, not satisfied”

“I have the same retirement plans as other faculty, but for reasons I cannot understand phased retirement is not an option. Once again why not give departments/colleges this option if it makes sense for all involved?”

“I did not know I could not continue to use the library and rec center.”

8. **The Nature of Your Work (PT and FT)**
   - 137 respondents ranked the most important NTT faculty issues to be addressed out of nine issues.
   - 67% (92) of the respondents ranked “increased job security through multi-year contracts” as either first or second in importance, with 56 respondents ranking it first.
   - 52% (72) ranked “salary disparity” as either first or second in importance, with 37 respondents ranking it first.
• “Opportunities for promotion” and “teaching load” were ranked almost equally as the third most important issues.
• “Opportunities for promotion” and “eligibility for awards” were ranked almost equally as fourth.
• “Departmental participation and voting rights” were ranked fifth, followed by “eligibility for grants and awards” sixth, “departmental participation and voting rights” seventh, “eligibility for the faculty mentoring program” and “eligibility to participate in faculty governance/Senate” eighth, and “eligibility for phased retirement and Emeritus status” eighth.
• When asked about satisfaction with their workplace, 50% (64 of 128) said they were “very satisfied” with their department and 43% (55 of 129) said they were “very satisfied” with UNCG as a place to work.
• When asked about equitable treatment of all faculty at the departmental level, 51% (67) of 131 respondents agreed that treatment was equitable while 35% (46) disagreed.

Results of Final Three Open-Ended Questions (PT and FT)

What do you view as the best aspects of working as a NTT Faculty member at UNCG?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Teaching/working with students</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Flexibility/limited responsibilities</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Department/environment</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples of Comments:

1. “We get to do what we love to do – teach.”
   “The best aspects involve working with the students, working on improving my teaching effectiveness, [and] getting to be involved with teaching a subject I love.”

2. “I am a faculty member with flexibility (unlike most professions) but I don’t have to worry about research!”
   “Freedom of a teaching job that allows me time off when I need it outside of teaching responsibilities. Opportunities to develop my teaching techniques and apply them in the class.”
3. “I like the environment in my department. People are open and friendly.”

“I love my program, I love my coworkers’ dedication to the program, I love UNCG and am grateful to have a job doing something I both love and believe in.”

**What do you view as the biggest challenge of working in a NTT Faculty position at UNCG?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Job security</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>39.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Second class status</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Salary</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Large teaching load</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples of Comments:

1. “The constant uncertainty about job security which makes it difficult not only to plan personally but also to be a consistent presence for students from semester to semester.”

2. “The feeling of being a lower class citizen and be awarded less for equal or better performance can be demoralizing.”

3. “Pay and benefits are limited.”

   “The disparity is huge, when even first year tenure track hires are making almost twice...”

   “There is a large discrepancy between work load, expectations and salary. Workload is too demanding the pay.”

4. “No time for research and publication because of heavy lesson prep and grading.”

   “Much is expected in regards to teaching load but not much recognition for teaching.”
What recommendations do you have, if any, to improve the working conditions of NTT Faculty at UNCG?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Job security</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Higher salary</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Recognition</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Equality</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Promotion/more opportunities</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Representation</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.93%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples of Comments:

1. “Improve job security with better contracts.”

   “Multi-year teaching contracts would be nice; it’s difficult to feel secure when your ability to support your family financially is uncertain from semester to semester.”

2. “If you want quality teaching from NTT faculty, then they should be treated with respect and as professionals. Increasing pay, even a tiny amount, would be a token of good faith.”

3. “Provide opportunities for recognition and representation for NTT – recognize the service they provide to the university rather than just low paid teachers that are disposable.”

4. “The inequities in the workload are certainly a dissatisfier for me, and I sometimes have to remind myself that there is no reason to put my all into my courses when it will go unrewarded.”

5. “Enable NTTs to be eligible for promotion and pursue their own research interests.”

6. “We need representation within the university. We should have one or more senators on staff senate.”
The Task Force on NTT Faculty welcomes any additional comments that you might have.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Appreciation</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Inequality in working conditions</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13.21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples of Comments:

1. “I think this is a terrific undertaking and I just hope something comes out of this.”

   “I appreciate that there is interest at the highest levels of the administration in studying conditions for NTT faculty with the possibility of making improvements.”

2. “I realize that UNCG is considered a research univ., but teaching should be valued. NTT faculty teach the vast majority of the undergraduates. I have more students in one semester than a TT faculty member in my dept. has in an entire year. I may not do research or serve on committees, but I still have a huge workload and would like to have more time for profes. develop. and deserve a better salary.”

   “Please convey to the administration that the question of NTT faculty working conditions is really about getting the best value for the institution from the faculty. Discrimination based upon job class involves loss to the institution of what those NTT faculty could do if only given a chance to prove themselves.”
Results, cont. Several variables were chosen for comparison and yielded some interesting trends as can be seen in the graphs below:

**Highest Degree and Full or Part-Time Status**

Although 53% of full-time survey respondents have a Master’s degree, 44% of the full-time respondents hold a terminal degree. Part time NTT faculty have an almost equal number of doctorates and master’s degrees.

**Highest Degree and Gender**

Female NTT faculty respondents significantly outnumber their male colleagues, representing more than twice as many of the NTT respondents at the Master’s level and approximately 25% more at the Doctoral level.
Promotion eligibility significantly increases for NTT faculty with more than two years of service, and then decreases after fifteen years and above. NTT faculty respondents who are NOT eligible for promotion greatly outnumber those who are eligible.

Among those responding, there are nearly twice as many female full-time NTT faculty members as male. Women also made up a significantly larger number of part-time NTT faculty responding to the survey.
Length of Current Contract and Promotion

The large majority of NTT faculty respondents are employed on a contract of less than two years. Clearly those employed on such contracts are not eligible for promotion.

Full-Time Salary and Promotion Eligibility

Those respondents who indicated a salary range of $55,000-64,000 also have the highest instance of eligibility for promotion. This is not surprising: as noted in the Phase I Report, there is a direct correlation between salary and promotion eligibility.
Despite the heavy teaching load for full time NTT faculty the majority of respondents receive no mentoring, observation (which they do not classify as mentoring), or limited mentoring for their teaching responsibilities.

The survey responses seem to indicate that women are more likely to be employed in lower salaried positions while the numbers even out as the salaries become higher. However, at nearly every salary level the female respondents outnumber the male.
UNCG'S 2008 RESPONSE TO UNC 2002 REPORT ON NTT FACULTY

In 2002, the UNC Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty submitted to the Board of Governors a report on the state of NTT faculty which included these recommendations for the system as a whole:

- offer multi-year contracts for three or more years to NTT faculty
- use advanced titles and ranks with appropriate salary increases
- provide institutional support necessary to perform duties
- include in decision-making processes at the department, college, and university level
- provide professional development and recognition opportunities for NTT faculty
- ensure appropriate compensation based upon duties, responsibilities, qualifications, and experience

In 2008 the committee released the responses of each campus to these recommendations. This information can be found:


How does the 2008 response to the recommendations compare to recent practice at UNCG? In 2008, UNCG reported implementation by all units for multi-year NTT contracts (although this was never the case for all individual NTT faculty, some of whom still held one-year contracts). With recent budget cuts most units at UNCG have reduced or eliminated multi-year NTT contracts. The use of advanced ranks with salary increase has also been impacted by budget cuts with some units putting plans on hold. This Task Force recognizes the efforts of UNCG units to enact some of the UNC recommendations and the special roadblocks recent budgets have put in front of these efforts. It is our hope that work will continue once budgets improve and that other UNC recommendations from 2002, reflected in this Task Force's recommendations below, can also be enacted.

RECOMMENDATIONS

These recommendations articulate essential standards of professional equity. Currently, as this Task Force Report makes clear, UNCG does not meet these standards, either as a university or within units and departments.

Although the Task Force has recommended some specific actions, the responsibility for shaping and implementing remedies for existing inequities lies with the Faculty Senate and the Provost. With this in mind, the Task Force nonetheless proposes two primary, overarching lines of action:
• Representation in faculty governance at all levels, and especially in the University Faculty Senate, should be the first priority. Participation in governance is the first, fundamental step from which all other reforms can then most readily proceed. This expansion of shared governance is budget-proof, meaning that it could be accomplished without worries about future resources. NTT representation in governance also opens a permanent channel through which progress can be made toward increased job security and salary equity.

• Once the Senate and the Provost have established the specific standards against which equity for UNCG faculty will be measured, all units and departments should demonstrate continuing progress toward the achievement of these standards. If there are substantive reasons for some divergence from these standards, the appropriate unit should provide a rationale for these special instances to the Provost's Office. This rationale should be based in disciplinary needs, unusual faculty credentials, and other substantive differences that are not purely resource-driven. In the absence of such a rationale, these equitable standards should be met. The Provost's Office should be responsible for monitoring, encouraging, and supporting units' progress toward equitable conditions for NTT faculty.

Recommendations for Professional Conditions and Voice

1. Full-time NTT faculty should be directly involved, as are full-time TT faculty, in deciding policy in those areas where they already have critical institutional responsibilities, concerns and expertise, such as: curriculum, program requirements, instructional goals, student learning outcomes, and strategic planning. NTT faculty should play a primary role in search committees for NTT positions and in review of NTT candidates for reappointment and for promotion.

2. NTT faculty should have active participation, representation and voting rights in decisions related to University policies and procedures, and to the academic and work environments, as do tenure-track faculty: one faculty, one voice. Appropriate means should be developed to include full-time NTT faculty into shared governance roles at all levels of the University, from the departmental level up to and including Faculty Senate. Full-time NTT faculty should be eligible for election to Faculty Senate, where their representation could be ensured by a combination of dedicated and open-election seats, filled either by in-unit or at-large elections, up to no more than 40% of the total number of Senators.

3. Policies and procedures guiding appointment, reappointment, and promotion in rank should be standard at both the University and unit levels for full-time NTT faculty. For consistency, the University Guidelines should include general areas for evaluation, criteria for promotion, and
the appropriate timelines and documentation needed for achieving promotion and/or reappointment. Unit guidelines should describe the same areas with greater specificity.

4. Multi-year contracts that increase in length with promotion should become standard as NTT faculty meet the criteria established by the University Guidelines. Stability of employment and increased job security were ranked as the highest priorities for NTT faculty responding to the Phase II Survey, and are in the best interests of the learning environment of the University.

Recommendations for Compensation

5. Full-time NTT faculty salaries and benefits should reflect their professional qualifications and should be comparable with full-time tenure-track faculty at UNCG with similar credentials.

6. Full-time NTT faculty should be eligible for regular salary increases on a comparable basis with TT faculty. Merit raises, promotion raises, and equity adjustments should be available to full-time NTT faculty through the salary increase process in the same ways as they are available to full-time TT faculty.

Recommendations for Professional Responsibility, Support and Recognition

7. Full-time NTT faculty should receive full access to teaching and professional development resources generally available to full-time TT faculty, such as: mentoring in research and teaching through programs like the UNCG Mentoring Program; research leaves; eligibility for internal and external grant support; professional travel funds; reimbursement for professional dues or licensure fees; and eligibility for phased retirement and Emeritus status.

8. Full-time NTT faculty whose primary responsibility is teaching or supervision should be eligible for recognition for the same type of teaching awards as TT faculty. Furthermore full-time NTT faculty should receive the same monetary awards as TT faculty when they meet the criteria for an award.

9. Full-time NTT faculty should be provided with adequate support to carry out their assigned duties, including suitable office space, telephone, computer, administrative support and other equipment to fulfill the requirements of their duties.
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Introduction

Based on data collected by the American Federation of Teachers of Higher Education (AFT) (2005), the number and proportion of educators employed at the university level who are not members of the tenure track (TT) faculty is steadily rising. Between the fall semesters of 1987 and 2003 the number of full-time faculty who were not on the tenure track increased from 40,800 to 161,300, indicating that non-tenure track (NTT) faculty now represent approximately 25% of all full-time faculty at institutions with tenure systems. Since 1995 more than 50% of all new full-time faculty hires were NTT.

Despite the growing number of NTT teaching faculty, “[these] dedicated professionals...do not share in the traditional rights, responsibilities, and prerogatives of full-time tenure-track faculty” (AFT, p. 10). Another growing trend noted by the AFT is that women who are employed full-time are more likely to be NTT.

According to the UNC Constituent Institution Responses to the Report of the Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty (2008), the presence of NTT faculty (both full-time and part-time) in the fifteen UNC universities with a tenure system increased from 38% in 1997 to 49% in 2007. During the same period the NTT faculty who were part-time decreased from 49% to 43%.

The following data in Table 1 from the UNCG Fact Book (2009-2010) depict the number of full-time and part-time NTT faculty at UNCG for the 10 year period spanning 1997 to 2007. The trend over this period shows a steady growth of NTT faculty comparable to the growth seen in the UNC system and national levels. During this period the percentage of full-time NTT faculty increased from 21% to 28%. Full-time and part-time NTT faculty taken together increased from 43% of all UNCG faculty in 1997 to 53% of all faculty in 2007.

Table 1. Distribution of UNCG Faculty by Full-Time/Part-Time and Tenure Status Over a 10 Year Span

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total #</th>
<th>Total Faculty</th>
<th>Tenure-Track Faculty</th>
<th>Non-Tenure Track Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Full Time</td>
<td>Part Time</td>
<td>Full Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>823</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>942</td>
<td>728</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>1229</td>
<td>911</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These trends have brought increasing attention to the employment conditions of NTT faculty. In February 2010, after a decade of intermittent data-gathering by the UNC system and its individual campuses, Provost David Perrin and the UNCG Faculty Senate jointly constituted a UNCG Task Force on Non-Tenure Track Faculty. The Task Force was charged with gathering information about NTT faculty at UNCG, and then preparing a final report for the Provost and Senate that includes recommendations toward the improvement of NTT faculty working conditions. The work of the Task Force was divided into three phases, as delineated by the sidebar. The report that you are reading is the Phase I Report.

Rights and Benefits of NTT Faculty at UNCG

The following section of the report presents the differences in rights and benefits between the tenure-track/tenured faculty and their full-time non-tenure-track faculty colleagues. These differences may be read in the context of The University of North Carolina at Greensboro Strategic Plan 2009-2014, which states that UNCG is “an inclusive, collaborative, and responsive institution” whose core values include “inclusiveness based on open dialogue and shared governance.”

This section of the report will be sub-divided into the following seven areas of faculty rights and benefits:

1. University Governance
2. Departmental Governance
3. Teaching
4. Awards and Grants
5. Promotion and Salary
6. Job Security
7. Retirement
University Governance

Governance, as the name implies, refers to those legislative bodies which form the nerve center of the faculty. Participation in these organizations and committees is vital to appropriate representation of all faculty. The following table (Table 2) delineates those bodies of governance for which faculty are eligible or ineligible.

Table 2. Rights and Benefits: Governance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rights and Benefits: Governance</th>
<th>Source of Information</th>
<th>Tenure Track Faculty</th>
<th>Full-Time Non-Tenure Track Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Senate</td>
<td>Article 3, Section 2.1 Constitution of the Faculty</td>
<td>Members elected from the general faculty holding the rank of Professor, Associate, or Assistant Professor and must be members of the Graduate Faculty, associate members of the Graduate Faculty, and Professional Librarians.</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committees of the Faculty Senate</td>
<td>Faculty Senate and General Faculty Committee Roster, 2009-2010, Faculty Senate web page</td>
<td>Elected either by Senate or appointed by Senate Chair</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Senate</td>
<td>Staff Senate web page</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Without a presence in any university-wide governing body, NTT faculty members do not participate directly in the determination of university policies and procedures.
Departmental Governance

While the general term “governance” refers to participation in the legislative bodies of the university at large, departmental governance can provide a voice to faculty within their immediate work environment. Table 3 presents information about the participation of tenure track and non-tenure track faculty in departmental governance.

Table 3. Rights and Benefits: Departmental Governance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rights and Benefits: Departmental Governance</th>
<th>Source of Information</th>
<th>Tenure Track Faculty</th>
<th>Non-Tenure Track Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Departmental Faculty Meetings</td>
<td>From Task Force Committee members</td>
<td>Full participation and voting rights, with these limited only in promotion and tenure deliberations to appropriate ranks</td>
<td>Varies by departments from no participation in voting to full participation in voting (exception being tenure and promotion decisions for tenure track faculty)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Teaching

Teaching forms the backbone of any institution of higher learning and comprises the main responsibility of most full-time non-tenure track faculty. **Table 4** depicts the rights and benefits provided to teaching faculty while **Figure 1** (from the Office of Institutional Research) shows the breakdown of teaching load, defined as average students per course, of different categories of the faculty.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rights and Benefits: Teaching</th>
<th>Source of Information</th>
<th>Tenure Track Faculty</th>
<th>Full-Time Non-Tenure Track Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring Program</td>
<td><strong>SOURCE</strong>: <a href="http://www.unCG.edu/tlc/mentoring/">http://www.unCG.edu/tlc/mentoring/</a></td>
<td>Open to all full-time (FT) faculty in tenure-track positions at rank of Assistant Professor or above who are new appointees or in their first or second year of teaching</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointment to the Graduate Faculty</td>
<td>Approved by the Provost in 1988, and revised/approved by the UNCG Graduate Studies Committee in October, 2009</td>
<td>Open to all tenured or TT faculty who hold a terminal degree; open to research and academic professionals who hold a terminal degree, e.g., research scientists holding FT EPA non-faculty academic positions and academic professional faculty provided they “have competence in research/creative activities.”</td>
<td>Eligible as academic professional members only with a terminal degree; eligible as an adjunct member with an “advanced degree” and responsibilities within the graduate program; may teach any graduate course except those offered exclusively to doctoral students; may serve as members only of Master’s Thesis Committees and of Doctoral Advisory/Dissertation Committees</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NTT faculty with a terminal degree are eligible for appointment to the Graduate Faculty.**

**NTT faculty are not eligible for a program that would assist them in improving their teaching abilities through mentoring by experienced faculty members.**
NTT faculty teach an average of 47% more students per course than tenured faculty, 33% more than tenure track faculty, and an average of more than 28% more students per course than Graduate Teaching Assistants (GTA).

Part-time faculty teach an average of 40% more students per course than tenured faculty, 25% more students per course than tenure track faculty, and an average of 18% more students per course than GTAs.

Figure 1. Average Student Per Course Load by Faculty Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students Taught by Faculty Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students per Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2007</th>
<th>Spring 2008</th>
<th>Fall 2008</th>
<th>Spring 2009</th>
<th>Fall 2009</th>
<th>Spring 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department Head</td>
<td>12.34</td>
<td>12.62</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>12.65</td>
<td>14.32</td>
<td>11.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured Faculty</td>
<td>13.82</td>
<td>12.55</td>
<td>13.09</td>
<td>13.38</td>
<td>15.57</td>
<td>14.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTA</td>
<td>17.88</td>
<td>17.38</td>
<td>19.43</td>
<td>19.33</td>
<td>17.96</td>
<td>21.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>24.58</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>23.88</td>
<td>21.08</td>
<td>25.56</td>
<td>21.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Awards and Grants for Tenure-Track and Non-Tenure Track Faculty

Awards and grants provide incentives for faculty to perform to the highest standards of excellence both in their educational duties and their fields of research. The following tables (Tables 5 and 6) depict the eligibility for internal awards and grants for performance in teaching, professional development, and research.

### Table 5. Right and Benefits: Teaching Awards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Award</th>
<th>Source of Information</th>
<th>Tenure Track Faculty</th>
<th>Full-Time Non-Tenure Track Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Alumni Teaching Excellence Award</td>
<td><strong>SOURCE</strong> for award dates: <a href="http://www.uncg.edu/tlc/instructional/grants/awards/">http://www.uncg.edu/tlc/instructional/grants/awards/</a>  <strong>SOURCE</strong> for selection criteria: <a href="http://provost.uncg.edu/underedu/content/ATEA/docs/criteria.pdf">http://provost.uncg.edu/underedu/content/ATEA/docs/criteria.pdf</a></td>
<td>$7,500 for a tenured faculty member</td>
<td>$4,500 for a non-tenured faculty member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Board of Governors Award</td>
<td><strong>SOURCE</strong>: <a href="http://provost.uncg.edu/Underedu/content/ATEA/docs/criteria.pdf">http://provost.uncg.edu/Underedu/content/ATEA/docs/criteria.pdf</a></td>
<td>$7,500 for a tenured faculty member</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NTT faculty receive $3,000 less for teaching excellence awards and are not rewarded by the Board of Governors at all.
### Table 6. Right and Benefits: Grants for Professional Development and Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant</th>
<th>Source of Information</th>
<th>TT Faculty</th>
<th>Full-Time NTT Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advancement of Teaching and Learning Grants</td>
<td><strong>SOURCE</strong> <a href="http://www.uncg.edu/tlc/instructional/grants/atl_info.html">http://www.uncg.edu/tlc/instructional/grants/atl_info.html</a></td>
<td>Eligible with preference given to full-time continuing faculty at UNCG</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mini-Grants (MG)</td>
<td><strong>SOURCE</strong> <a href="http://www.uncg.edu/tlc/instructional/grants/minigrant.html">http://www.uncg.edu/tlc/instructional/grants/minigrant.html</a></td>
<td>Eligible with preference given to faculty who have not previously received a MG</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John and Mary Hamil Fund</td>
<td><strong>SOURCE</strong> <a href="http://www.uncg.edu/tlc/instructional/grants/hamil.html">http://www.uncg.edu/tlc/instructional/grants/hamil.html</a></td>
<td>Eligible only to full-time tenure track faculty teaching 100-200 level courses</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholars Travel Fund</td>
<td><strong>SOURCE</strong> <a href="http://www.uncg.edu/rsh/scholarstravel.html">http://www.uncg.edu/rsh/scholarstravel.html</a></td>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intramural Funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• New Faculty Research Grant (NFRG)</td>
<td><strong>SOURCE</strong> NFRG <a href="http://www.uncg.edu/rsh/newfacultyrg.html">http://www.uncg.edu/rsh/newfacultyrg.html</a></td>
<td>• NFRG—Eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Regular Faculty Research Grant (RFRG)</td>
<td><strong>SOURCE</strong> RFRG <a href="http://www.uncg.edu/rsh/regularfacultyrg.html">http://www.uncg.edu/rsh/regularfacultyrg.html</a></td>
<td>• RFRG—Eligible</td>
<td>• NFRG— Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Summer Excellence Research Grant (SERG)</td>
<td><strong>SOURCE</strong> SERG <a href="http://www.uncg.edu/rsh/regularfacultyrg.html">http://www.uncg.edu/rsh/regularfacultyrg.html</a></td>
<td>• SERG—Eligible</td>
<td>• RFRG—Some clinical/applied faculty eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kohler Fund</td>
<td><strong>SOURCE</strong> <a href="http://www.uncg.edu/jpg/kohlerbrochure.pdf">http://www.uncg.edu/jpg/kohlerbrochure.pdf</a></td>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Arnold Carlisle Faculty Research Grant</td>
<td><strong>SOURCE</strong> <a href="http://www.uncg.edu/wms/secondary_pages/financial.html#fac">http://www.uncg.edu/wms/secondary_pages/financial.html#fac</a></td>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The International Travel Fund (ITF)</td>
<td><strong>SOURCE</strong> <a href="http://www.uncg.edu/jpg/itfbrochure.pdf">http://www.uncg.edu/jpg/itfbrochure.pdf</a></td>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Assignment</td>
<td><strong>SOURCE</strong> <a href="http://provost.uncg.edu/publications/personnel/resassign.asp">http://provost.uncg.edu/publications/personnel/resassign.asp</a></td>
<td>Eligible if tenured</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Approximately 57% (4/7) of units on campus have promotion policies for non-tenure track faculty.

Table 7. Rights and Benefits: Promotion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rights and Benefits: Salary and Promotion</th>
<th>Source of Information</th>
<th>Tenure Track Faculty</th>
<th>Non-Tenure Track Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>SOURCE</strong> <a href="http://provost.uncg.edu/publications/personnel/pt.asp">http://provost.uncg.edu/publications/personnel/pt.asp</a></td>
<td>3.H.1: Department head consults annually with the appropriate members of the faculty as indicated in Section 3.G.</td>
<td>Bryan School of Business: Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Candidates selected from all full-time faculty below the rank of Professor for promotion and/or permanent tenure.</td>
<td>Health and Human Performance: Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Unit-Specific Promotions and Tenure Documents)</td>
<td>Music: Not eligible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2. Estimated Marginal Means of 9-Month Equivalent Salary by Track Type and Promotion Policy
(From the Office of Institutional Research)

The average salary difference between TT and NTT in the university as a whole is almost $39,000. The difference decreases to $28,000 when a promotion policy is present.
Job Security

Once achieved, tenure is understood to confer life-long employment security. The security of tenured status, which may be sought by all on the tenure track, contrasts with the brief contractual employment status of NTT faculty. Although NTT faculty may be employed over long periods through serial renewal of their contracts, the end of a contract is sufficient warrant to end their employment at any time.

Non-Tenure Track Faculty Policies

NTT faculty members are not eligible to apply for permanent tenure. The retention protocols for NTT faculty depend upon the department of the university in which the NTT faculty member is employed, and upon the rank they hold, if any, within the department. For example:

The School of Human and Environmental Sciences

- Initial appointments to these AP non-tenure track positions range from one to five years.
- Reappointment is granted for successive renewable terms of three to five years based on successful annual and cumulative performance reviews and recommendations to the Dean by the Department Head.

English Department

- Full-time teaching lecturers without administrative duties have one-year contracts.
- These lecturers must reapply for a new one-year contract at the end of each year, with a usual maximum of three years of one year contracts.

Tenured Faculty Review Policy

Any faculty member in a TT position is eligible to apply for tenure. Once tenured in the UNC system, a faculty member may be terminated only for specified institutional or individual failures such as:

- Financial exigency
- Major curtailment or elimination of a teaching, research, or public-service program
- Incompetence
- Sustained failure to meet assigned classes or to perform other significant faculty professional obligations
- Illegal, inappropriate, or unethical conduct

Document Link
## Retirement

When NTT faculty retire, their rights to continual access to university facilities are significantly fewer than those of TT faculty. Tenured faculty members may continue to use the facilities, both recreational and scholarly, of the university; however, their non-tenured colleagues lose most or all of those benefits upon retirement.

Table 8 describes the retirement benefits available to faculty at UNCG.

### Table 8. Rights and Benefits: Retirement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rights and Benefits: Retirement</th>
<th>Source of Information</th>
<th>Tenured Faculty</th>
<th>Non-Tenure Track Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retirement Programs such as TSERS and TIAA-CREF</td>
<td>SOURCE: <a href="http://web.uncg.edu/hrs/Benefits/Benefits_Summary/">http://web.uncg.edu/hrs/Benefits/Benefits_Summary/</a></td>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Emeritus Status | SOURCE: [http://provost.uncg.edu/faculty/h_section5.asp#sec5_b_5](http://provost.uncg.edu/faculty/h_section5.asp#sec5_b_5) | Open to FT tenured appointments upon retirement; Continues access to University services and privileges such as:  
- library privileges  
- parking privileges  
- i.d. cards for access to academic and recreational areas  
- faculty rates for productions and events  
- receipt of announcements | Most not eligible  
Exceptions made by Board of Trustees in cases of exceptional distinguished service  
Open to senior administrators in the Division of Academic Affairs  
Must have a doctorate or appropriate terminal degree in their field |
| Phased Retirement | SOURCE: [http://provost.uncg.edu/faculty/h_section5.asp#sec5_c_6a](http://provost.uncg.edu/faculty/h_section5.asp#sec5_c_6a) | Open only to FT tenured faculty and tenured professional librarians  
- 50% of FT salary received by phased retirees  
- Participation in employee benefit plans and programs allowed  
- Typical contracts of half-time service for a three year period allowed to phased retirees | Not eligible |
Inventory of Practices and Policies Concerning NTT Faculty at UNCG, Fall 2009

Introduction

In addition to a comparison of the rights and responsibilities granted to tenure track and non-tenure track faculty, the Task Force gathered information about the policies and practices of each unit, and their constituent departments and programs that govern crucial aspects of NTT employment.

The information in the tables that follow comes from two sources. Table 9 shows the numbers and percentages of TT and NTT faculty in 2009-2010, and is drawn from The UNCG Fact Book. Tables 10 and 11 display information gathered by Task Force members about policy documents, workload, evaluation, and salary and promotion. This information was gathered directly from the schools, College, departments and programs by Task Force members; it is a "snapshot" of the state of affairs in Fall Semester 2009.

For these reasons the information may seem out of synch with the present in certain ways. For instance, the School of Music is now (in Spring Semester 2011) the School of Music, Theatre and Dance, with Theater joining the new school from the College and Dance from HHP. So the information for Music refers only to the old configuration. It may also be that various policy documents have been revised or updated since Fall Semester 2009, in ways this report does not display. Because the intention of this Inventory is to guide the development of broad recommendations for the University, rather than to comment in close detail on the practices of smaller bodies, the Task Force believes this data is sufficient for its work.
Table 9. Inventory: University Faculty by School and Employment Status

(Sample drawn from the 2009-2010 Academic Year)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College/School</th>
<th>Tenure Track</th>
<th>Non-Tenure Track</th>
<th>Total Faculty</th>
<th>% NTT Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Human Performance</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Environmental Sciences</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Totals</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Total Tenure Track**: 587
- **Total Non-Tenure Track**: 504

NTT faculty as a percentage of total faculty at UNCG has decreased by 7% from 2007 to 2009. The percentage of NTT who are part time has increased from 25% to almost 29% in academic year 2009-2010.

These trends most likely reflect the influence of the budget crisis over the past two years.

Untenured full time positions are at greatest risk during periods of budget cuts.

Data from the UNCG Fact Book 2009-2010
Table 10 below shows the wide variation of policies and practices governing NTT faculty among the various academic units. Appointment and promotion policies, job security, standard work loads, evaluation criteria, and opportunities for promotion and salary increase differ widely from unit to unit apparently depending on precedent and the needs of the academic discipline.

### Table 10. Inventory Data: Policies and Work Load of NTT Faculty, Fall 2009  
(From the Task Force Inventory Sub-Committee)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Documents</th>
<th>Bryan School of Business (5 Departments)</th>
<th>School of Education (5 Departments)</th>
<th>College of Arts and Sciences (19 Departments)</th>
<th>Health and Human Performance (5 Departments)</th>
<th>Human and Environmental Sciences (5 Departments)</th>
<th>Music</th>
<th>Nursing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contracts for FT NTT Faculty in Years</td>
<td>Two depts at 1-3 years, one at 1 year, one at variable lengths</td>
<td>Three at 5 years, one at 1-5 years, one at 1-3 years</td>
<td>Eight are at 1-3 years, seven are at 1 year, four are N/A.</td>
<td>All five at 1-5 years</td>
<td>Two at 3-5 years, one at 3 years, one at 1-5 years, one variable</td>
<td>1-3 years</td>
<td>1-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointment Promotion</td>
<td>Three with none, one in progress</td>
<td>Two have documents, three have none</td>
<td>Three are N/A, sixteen have none</td>
<td>All use HHP document</td>
<td>All use HES document</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Nursing School has document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Documents</td>
<td>Bryan School documents apply</td>
<td>School of Education documents apply</td>
<td>Two are N/A, ten have none, and five have other documents.</td>
<td>HHP documents apply</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Load</td>
<td>Three at 4/4, one N/A</td>
<td>2 at 4/4, 1 at 1/1, 2 variable at 1-5 courses/semester</td>
<td>Nine at 4/4, three at 3/3, one at 2/2, three N/A</td>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>at 3/2</td>
<td>at 4/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Load</td>
<td>Three at average of 27, one N/A</td>
<td>Three at average of 22, one at zero, one N/A</td>
<td>Four at average of 21, three variable, nine at zero, three N/A</td>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Three at the equivalent of 3 classes, one variable, one N/A</td>
<td>The equivalent of one 3 credit hour course.</td>
<td>175 freshman between two NTT faculty; other NTT have 20-25...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Criteria</td>
<td>Bryan School of Business (5 Departments)</td>
<td>School of Education (5 Departments)</td>
<td>College of Arts and Sciences (19 Departments)</td>
<td>Health and Human Performance (5 Departments)</td>
<td>Human and Environmental Sciences (5 Departments)</td>
<td>Music</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>Three evaluate NTT teaching, 1 N/A</td>
<td>All evaluate teaching</td>
<td>Sixteen evaluate teaching, one does not, two are N/A</td>
<td>All evaluate teaching</td>
<td>All evaluate teaching</td>
<td>Evaluates teaching</td>
<td>Evaluates teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Two evaluate NTT service, one varies with position, one N/A</td>
<td>All evaluate service</td>
<td>Ten evaluate service, seven do not, two N/A</td>
<td>All evaluate service</td>
<td>All evaluate service</td>
<td>Evaluates service</td>
<td>Evaluates service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>One evaluates NTT research, two do not, one N/A</td>
<td>Three state that it is valued, two do not evaluate research</td>
<td>Three evaluate research, thirteen do not, three N/A</td>
<td>All evaluate research</td>
<td>All evaluate research</td>
<td>Evaluates research</td>
<td>Evaluates research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Three have no other criteria, two are N/A</td>
<td>One evaluates clinical practices, one leadership, one administrative responsibilities, two have no other criteria</td>
<td>Two evaluate on other criteria, fifteen do not, 2 N/A</td>
<td>None have other criteria</td>
<td>Directed professional activity if appropriate to position</td>
<td>Directed professional activity if appropriate to position</td>
<td>Evaluates clinical work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary Increases</td>
<td>Two allow for salary increases, two N/A</td>
<td>All allow for salary increases</td>
<td>Twelve allow for incremental salary increases, six are N/A, one is unreported</td>
<td>All allow for salary increases</td>
<td>All allow for incremental increases</td>
<td>Allows for salary increases</td>
<td>Allows for salary increases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>One has promotion possibility, one does not, one N/A</td>
<td>All have promotional opportunities for Clinical Professionals</td>
<td>Thirteen have no promotions, six N/A</td>
<td>All have promotion opportunities</td>
<td>All have promotion opportunities</td>
<td>The University promotions documents apply</td>
<td>Has promotion opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion Raises</td>
<td>Three offer promotion raises, one N/A</td>
<td>All offer promotion raises</td>
<td>Eight have no promotion raises, eleven N/A</td>
<td>All offer promotion raises</td>
<td>All offer promotion raises</td>
<td>Does not offer promotion raises</td>
<td>Offers promotion raises</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of Phase I Report

This Phase I Report presents information about the status of NTT faculty in two sections: a comparison of TT and NTT faculty’s current rights and responsibilities, and an inventory of the array of current NTT faculty employment practices and policies across the academic units of UNCG. Some of the most striking findings have been presented in the blue sidebars throughout the report and are listed here again for your convenience.

- Without a presence in any university-wide governing body, NTT faculty members do not participate directly in the determination of university policies and procedures.
- There is great variability in terms of departmental participation of NTT faculty across the campus.
- NTT faculty are not eligible for a program that would assist them in improving their teaching abilities through mentoring by experienced faculty members.
- NTT faculty with a terminal degree are eligible for appointment to the Graduate Faculty.
- NTT faculty teach an average of 45% more students per course than TT faculty and an average of more than 25% more students per course than Graduate Teaching Assistants.
- NTT faculty receive $3,000 less for teaching excellence awards and are not rewarded by the Board of Governors at all.
- NTT Faculty are eligible for 57% of the university professional development and research grants and are not eligible for most intramural funding.
- Approximately 57% (4/7) of units on campus have promotion policies for non-tenure track faculty.
- The average salary difference between TT and NTT in the university as a whole is almost $39,000. The difference decreases to $28,000 when a promotion policy is present.
- Non-Tenure Track faculty employment contracts provide flexibility to the university at the cost of job security for those filling the NTT positions.
- NTT faculty who are not granted the exceptional Emeritus status cannot continue to use the library, recreation center, etc., even if they are employees of long-standing.
- Because all NTT faculty are ineligible for phased retirement, they cannot maintain reduced professional connections to the university for a short time as they transit into retirement, even if they have been at UNCG for many years.
- NTT faculty as a percentage of total faculty at UNCG has decreased by 7% from 2007 to 2009. The percentage of NTT who are part time has increased from 25% to 29% in academic year 2009-2010.
- These trends most likely reflect the influence of the budget crisis over the past two years. Untenured full time positions are at greatest risk during periods of budget cuts.

Broadly speaking, this collected information and the initial factual conclusions of the report may be summarized in two ways. First, and not surprisingly, this information confirms that TT faculty enjoy a much wider array of rights and responsibilities than NTT faculty do, even when NTT faculty members may have equivalent credentials and/or comparable years of experience and service at UNCG. Second, perhaps more surprisingly, the inventory in particular shows that NTT faculty employment policies and practices vary so widely among, and within, academic units that there is considerable inequity of rights and responsibilities even within the NTT faculty ranks. Both broad findings confirm the necessity of this present review of NTT faculty status at UNCG, and point toward the kinds of recommendations that may be expected in the Task Force’s Final Report.
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